			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
S.No	Industry	1996-97	1997-98	1998-99
9	Fenthion	111	207.2	26.3
10	Isoproturon	2879	1255.1	1047.2
11	Lindane	557	281.6	176.1
12	Malathion	1036	1321.0	1345.0
13	Quinilphos	351	237.6	186.0
14	Aluminium Phosphide	662	1421.5	

Source: DGCIS, Calcutta—Ministry of Commerce

Energy efficiency in urea plants

- 2174. SHRI ANANTRAY DEVSHANKER DAVE: Will the Minister of CHEMICALS AND FERTILIZERS be pleased to state:
- (a) the amount of subsidy that could be saved if gas-based fertilizer plants were to operate on energy efficiencies, compared to the world's best gas-based urea plants; and
- (b) the amount of subsidy that could be saved if the naphthabased fertilizer plants were to operate on energy efficiencies, compared to the world's best naphtha-based urea plants?

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF CHEMI-CALS AND FERTILIZERS (SHRI RAMESH BAIS): (a) and (b) The energy efficiency of Indian gas based fertilizer plants having regard to their age, technology, quality of indigenous gas supply and ambient conditions amongst other factors is close to those which are best achievable in the country. Similarly, the energy efficiency of naphtha based plants depend on vintage, technology used, ambient conditions and other related factors. The average energy consumption for naphtha based plants in the country was 7.34 mkcal/tonne urea during 1999-2000. However, two naphtha based plants which were commissioned recently have attained an energy consumption of around 6.10 makcal/tonne of urea which can be considered close to the best achiveable under Indian conditions. Factors narrated above coupled with non-availability of authentic figures for most efficient urea and naphtha plants in the world make it difficult to make any reasonable assessment of the saving in subsidy that could have been effected.